Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers for this purpose to such extent as may be necessary. The specific proposals to which I wish to give my entire support are those submitted by Professor J. Chester Bradley (Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.) as given by that scholar in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, volume 2, Part 2, of 20th April 1951, p. 53 seq., under Points (1), (2), (3) and (4).

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER ANY TWO GENERIC NAMES OR TRIVIAL NAMES, EACH BASED UPON THE SAME SURNAME OF A PERSON, WHOSE NAME IS NORMALLY WRITTEN IN SOME ALPHABET OTHER THAN THE LATIN ALPHABET, AND EACH HAVING THE SAME TERMINATION, BUT DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER IN THE TRANSLITERATION OF THE PORTION REPRESENTING THE PERSON'S NAME, ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER

By HELEN M. MUIR-WOOD, D.Sc.

(*Department of Geology, British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)530)

1. In the course of recent work it has been necessary to consider whether the generic names *Jakowleffia* Puton, 1875 (*Pet. Nouv. ent.* **1** (No. 128) : 512) (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) and *Yakovlevia* Fredericks, 1925 (*Rec. geol. Comm. Russian Far East* **40** : 7) (Brachiopoda) (non *Yakovlevia* Vologdin, 1931 (*Archaeocyathinae Siber.* : 36) (Archaeocyathinae)), are homonyms of one another and whether the later published of these names is invalid under Article 34 of the *Règles* and should be replaced by a new name.

2. The above names differ from one another in spelling to a greater extent than that specified in the provision inserted in Article 34 by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (*see* 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 161-162) and accordingly, if no other factors were involved, these names would not be homonyms of one another. On the other hand, each of these generic names is based upon the same Russian surname and each has the same termination. It is therefore only the accident of the method of transcription from the Cyrillic alphabet used respectively by Puton in 1875 and Fredericks in 1925 that is responsible for these names not being identical with one another and therefore identical homonyms. The question thus arises whether a pair of generic names differing from one another only for the foregoing reason can properly be regarded as different names or whether they should be treated as homonyms of one another.

3. The Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in 1948 agreed to include in one of the Schedules to the *Règles* rules for the transcription of words from the Cyrillic, to the Latin alphabet (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 228-229). These rules should be useful as a means for avoiding in future incorrect transliteration of words normally written in the Cyrillic alphabet, but the value of these rules is limited by reason of the fact that they are in the nature of recommendations to authors and are not mandatory provisions. A name incorrectly transliterated into the Latin alphabet will therefore not be subject to automatic emendation. Thus, even the new Schedule described above, though helpful as far as it goes, will provide no means for dealing with the problem which arises when two names (either generic names or trivial names) are published which through differences in the form of transliteration adopted are not homonyms of one another but which would be homonyms if there existed a prescribed method for transliterating into the Latin alphabet the word of which each of the two names is composed. Although the present case arises in connection with names based upon a word which, prior to Latinisation for the purposes of Article 13, were words belonging to a language using the Cyrillic alphabet, the problem involved is a general one and is liable to arise with names based upon words of any language that uses an alphabet other than the Latin alphabet.

4. It is accordingly suggested that, in view of the large number of scientific names for animals that are based upon the surnames of persons whose names, in their own country, would be written in the Cyrillic alphabet and the need for securing uniformity in the method of transliteration adopted and of providing also means for determining whether any given pair of such names should be regarded as homonyms of one another (under Article 34 or Article 35, as the case may be), it is desirable that early consideration should be given to the question of substituting mandatory provisions relating to the transliteration of such names in place of the permissive provisions annexed to the *Règles*, as a Schedule, by Paris Congress.

5. It is recognised that the foregoing suggestion may require some time for consideration, in view of the need for devising safeguards to prevent undesired changes in the spelling of well-established names. On the other hand, such considerations do not apply to the limited question relating to the interpretation of the Law of Homonymy with which the present application is primarily concerned. There is therefore no reason why an immediate decision should not be given on that particular question. Indeed, it is very desirable that a ruling should be given as quickly as possible, in order to dispel doubts which at present must attach to the status of a name such as that of the brachiopod genus *Yakovlevia* Fredericks.

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly requested to dispose of this question by rendering a *Declaration* containing a ruling, with reference to the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34 and 35) that, where each member of any given pair of generic names (or, if in any given genus, of any pair of trivial names, whether, on the one hand, specific or subspecific trivial names, or, on the other hand, infra-subspecific trivial names) (1) is based upon the same surname and that surname is normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet, and (2) has the same termination and/or suffix, but the two names differ from one another in spelling only by reason of differences adopted in the transliteration of the surname comprised in the generic names (or trivial names) in question, the two generic names in question (or, as the case may be, the two trivial names in question) are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

REQUEST FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION WHETHER ANY TWO NAMES, EACH BASED UPON A MODERN PATRONYMIC, ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER, WHEN THE PATRONYMICS IN QUESTION ARE IDENTICAL IN SPELLING BUT DIFFER THROUGH THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF AN UMLAUT OR OTHER DIACRITIC MARK

By HELEN M. MUIR-WOOD, D.Sc.

(*Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

1. The object of the present application is to obtain from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a ruling on the question whether the members of any given pair of generic names (or trivial names), each based upon a modern patronymic are to be regarded as homonyms of one another when the names in question are identical with one another except for the fact that the patronymic on which one of the names is based is distinguished by an umlaut or other diacritic mark, while the patronymic on which the other name is based is not so distinguished or is distinguished by a different diacritic mark.

2. An actual case of the above kind has arisen in the course of recent work. The particulars are as follows :—

(1) *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896
The name *Törnquistia* Reed (F.R.C.), 1896 (*Quart. J. geol. Soc. Lond.* **52** : 433) (Class Trilobita) was introduced as the name of a new subgenus of the genus *Cyphaspis* Burmeister, 1843 (Organ. Trilob. : 104). The nominal species *Cyphaspis* (*Törnquistia*) *nicholsoni*, then a new species, was designated as the type species of the new subgenus *Törnquistia* Reed. Reed referred in a footnote to Törnquist, 1884. *Undersökn. öfv Siljans. Trilobitenfauna ota Sver. geol. Undersökn, Lund.* **20** : No. 2. There is, therefore, no doubt that it was the Swedish palaeontologist Törnquist after whom the subgeneric name *Törnquistia* was given by Reed.